arXiv:math/0508543v1 [math.CA] 27 Aug 2005

L^p-SPECTRAL MULTIPLIERS FOR THE HODGE LAPLACIAN ACTING ON 1-FORMS ON THE HEISENBERG GROUP

Detlef Müller, Marco M. Peloso and Fulvio Ricci

Abstract. We prove that, if Δ_1 is the Hodge Laplacian acting on differential 1-forms on the $(2n+1)$-dimensional Heisenberg group, and if m is a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier on the positive half-line, with L^2-order of smoothness greater than $n+\frac{1}{2}$, then $m(\Delta_1)$ is L^p-bounded for $1 < p < \infty$. Our approach leads to an explicit description of the spectral decomposition of Δ_1 on the space of L^2-forms in terms of the spectral analysis of the sub-Laplacian L and the central derivative T, acting on scalar-valued functions.

Introduction

The $(2n+1)$-dimensional Heisenberg group H_n has a (unique modulo dilations) left-invariant Riemannian structure which is invariant under the action of the unitary group $U(n)$ by automorphisms (i.e. the natural action on the $\mathbb{C}^n$-component, when H_n is realized as $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{R}$). Various differential-geometric aspects of this structure have been analyzed in the literature [DT, L, R1, R2].

On the contrary, from an analytic point of view, most of the attention has been given to the operators related to the CR-structure on H_n, or to its sub-Riemannian structure (the sub-Laplacian and the Kohn Laplacians), leaving only a marginal rôle to the "Riemannian" operators. Our interest here is in the Hodge Laplacians $\Delta_k = dd^* + d^*d$ acting on differential k-forms on H_n, a family of operators that naturally arise in the Riemannian setting, and in their L^p-functional calculus. For $k \geq 1$, Δ_k is far from being diagonal (in contrast with the Kohn Laplacians for the $\bar{\partial}_b$-complex) in any reasonable basis of forms. This makes its analysis quite involved, with a level of complexity that increases with k (as long as $k \leq n$; it goes without saying that we are dispensed from treating higher values of k by Hodge duality). For this reason our results are limited to the case $k = 1$ (together with the "scalar" case $k = 0$), and we believe that investigating Laplacians on higher-order forms would require a more sophisticated understanding of the decomposition of the space of L^2-forms under the action of Δ_k.

Our main result is Theorem 6.8, proving that, if m is a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier on the positive half-line with a sufficiently high order of smoothness, then $m(\Delta_1)$ is bounded on 1-forms in L^p, for $1 < p < \infty$. The order of smoothness is measured in terms of "scale-invariant" local Sobolev norms (called $L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}$), and τ

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 43A80, 42B15.

This work has been supported by the the IHP network HARP "Harmonic Analysis and Related problems" of the European Union.

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TeX

is required to be strictly larger than $n+\frac{1}{2}$, i.e. half of the dimension of H_n as a manifold.

As a preliminary result, the same statement is proved for the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_0 acting on functions (Theorem 6.4). That the critical value for τ is $n+\frac{1}{2}$ in this case is not surprising, because Δ_0 locally behaves like the ordinary Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$, and at infinity like the sub-Laplacian L, and it is known that $n+\frac{1}{2}$ is critical for both these operators (see [MS] for what concerns L). To be more specific, if we scale on H_n isotropically by a parameter tending to zero, we produce a deformation of Δ_0 which in the limit gives the Laplacian; on the other hand, if we scale by a parameter tending to infinity in the automorphic (non-isotropic) way, the resulting deformation of Δ_0 tends to L [NRS]. As observed in [R2], this doubly asymptotic picture has no analogue for forms of order $k\geq 1$. The fact that $n+\frac{1}{2}$ remains the critical value for τ also when $k=1$ turns out to be a consequence of the fact that the space of L^2-1-forms decomposes as the orthogonal sum of five subspaces such that on each of them the action of Δ_1 is unitarily equivalent (possibly modulo an intertwining operator) to the action of a "scalar" differential or pseudo-differential operator related to Δ_0. Precisely, we find

1. the space V_1 of exact forms, where the action of Δ_1 is unitarily equivalent to Δ_0 acting on scalar functions;
2. the space V_2^+ of ∂_b^*-closed $(1,0)$-forms, where Δ_1 acts as $\Delta_0 - iT$ componentwise;
3. the space V_2^- of $\bar\partial_b^*$-closed $(0,1)$-forms, where Δ_1 acts as $\Delta_0 + iT$ componentwise;
4. two other subspaces, $V_3^\pm$, where the action of Δ_1 is unitarily equivalent to that of $\Delta_0+\frac{n}{2}\pm\sqrt{\Delta_0+\frac{n^2}{4}}$ on scalar functions.

Whereas V_1, V_2^+, V_2^- can be detected by a simple inspection, the last two subspaces are not so visible, and their description involves a rather delicate formalism. The presence of $V_3^\pm$ had been detected before in [L] for H_1. We thank Michael Christ for bringing this reference to our attention.

Once this is established, the task is to prove first that the decomposition of the space of 1-forms into these five subspaces also makes sense in L^p for $p\neq 2$ in the range $1<p<\infty$ (i.e. to prove that the corresponding orthogonal projections are L^p-bounded), and then to prove that Mihlin-Hörmander multipliers with order of smoothness $\tau>n+\frac{1}{2}$ give bounded operators on L^p when applied to the five operators above. In doing so, we heavily rely on the results in [MRS1, MRS2].

1. The Hodge Laplacians

Let H_n be the $(2n+1)$-dimensional Heisenberg group with coordinates $(x,y,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$, and with a basis of left-invariant vector fields given by

$$X_j=\partial_{x_j}-\frac{y_j}{2}\partial_t\ ,\qquad Y_j=\partial_{y_j}+\frac{x_j}{2}\partial_t\ ,\qquad T=\partial_t\ , \tag{1.1}$$

for $1\leq j\leq n$. The dual basis of 1-forms is given by the $2n$ elementary forms $dx_j,\ dy_j$ and by the contact form

$$\theta=dt-\frac{1}{2}\sum^n(x_jdy_j-y_jdx_j)\ .$$

We denote by $\Lambda^k = \Lambda^k(\mathfrak{h}_n^*)$ the k-th exterior product of the dual of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_n$ of H_n (also identifiable with the space of left-invariant k-forms on H_n). We call

$$\mathcal{D}\Lambda^k(H_n) = \mathcal{D}(H_n) \otimes \Lambda^k$$

the space of smooth k-forms on H_n with compact support. This notation will be consistently adapted to function spaces other than $\mathcal{D}(H_n)$ or to subspaces of Λ^k.

We shall often meet differential (or pseudo-differential) operators which act separately on each scalar component of a given form. In these cases we will denote by the same symbol the operator, call it D, acting on scalar-valued functions, and the corresponding operator acting on forms, which should be more correctly denoted by $D \otimes I$.

It will be convenient for us to work with different bases of complex vector fields and forms. We then set

$$B_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_j - iY_j) \ , \qquad \bar{B}_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_j + iY_j) \ ,$$

and

$$\beta_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(dx_j + idy_j) \ , \qquad \bar{\beta}_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(dx_j - idy_j) \ .$$

The relevant commutation relation is

$$[B_j, \bar{B}_j] = iT \ .$$

The differential df of a smooth function is then given by

$$df = \sum_{j=1}^{n}(X_j f \, dx_j + Y_j f \, dy_j) + Tf \, \theta = \sum_{j=1}^{n}(B_j f \, \beta_j + \bar{B}_j f \, \bar{\beta}_j) + Tf \, \theta \ , \tag{1.2}$$

and similarly for exterior derivatives of differential forms. Observe that, in particular,

$$d\theta = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} dx_j \wedge dy_j = -i \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \wedge \bar{\beta}_j \ . \tag{1.3}$$

A k-form ω decomposes uniquely as

$$\omega = \omega_1 + \theta \wedge \omega_2 \ , \tag{1.4}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1 &= \sum_{|I|+|I'|=k} f_{I,I'} \beta^I \wedge \bar{\beta}^{I'} \\ \omega_2 &= \sum_{|I|+|I'|=k-1} g_{J,J'} \beta^J \wedge \bar{\beta}^{J'} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

where we have followed the usual convention that, if $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$ is a finite subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p$, then

$$\beta^I = \beta \wedge \beta \wedge \cdots \wedge \beta$$

and similarly for $\bar\beta^{I'}$.

Clearly, $\omega_2 = 0$ if $k = 0$ and $\omega_1 = 0$ for $k = 2n + 1$.

We say that ω is *horizontal* if $\omega_2 = 0$, and we call *horizontal differential* of a smooth function f the horizontal form

$$d_H f = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (B_j f\, \beta_j + \bar B_j f\, \bar\beta_j) \ . \tag{1.6}$$

We denote by Λ^k_H (resp. $\mathcal{D}\Lambda^k_H(H_n)$) the subspace of Λ^k consisting of horizontal k-forms which are left-invariant (resp. with compact support).

The notion of "horizontal form" presents serious problems, that are treated in a systematic way in [R1]. For instance, the natural extension to horizontal forms of the operator d_H in (1.6) does not define a complex, because $d_H^2 \neq 0$. However we shall not use any such property, and on the other hand (1.6) provides a convenient notation. For instance, w.r. to the decomposition (1.4), we have

$$d(\omega_1 + \theta \wedge \omega_2) = \big(d_H\omega_1 + (d\theta) \wedge \omega_2\big) + \theta \wedge (T\omega_1 - d_H\omega_2) \ . \tag{1.7}$$

Identifying ω with the pair $\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \end{pmatrix}$ in (1.4), the operator

$$d = d_k : \mathcal{D}\Lambda^k(H_n) \to \mathcal{D}\Lambda^{k+1}(H_n)$$

is then represented by the matrix

$$d = \begin{pmatrix} d_H & e(d\theta) \\ T & -d_H \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{1.8}$$

where e denotes exterior multiplication, i.e. $e(d\theta)\omega = (d\theta) \wedge \omega$.

We introduce on H_n the left-invariant Riemannian metric that makes the basis (1.1) orthonormal at each point. W.r. to the induced inner product on Λ^k, the elements

$$\beta^I \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \ , \qquad \theta \wedge \beta^J \wedge \bar\beta^{J'}$$

(with $|I| + |I'| = k$, $|J| + |J'| = k - 1$) also form an orthonormal basis. Let ω, ω' be two k-forms, with

$$\omega = \omega_1 + \theta \wedge \omega_2 \ , \qquad \omega' = \omega'_1 + \theta \wedge \omega'_2 \ ,$$

and let $f_{I,I'}, g_{J,J'}$ be the coefficients of ω as in (1.5), and $f'_{I,I'}, g'_{J,J'}$ the corresponding coefficients of ω'. The inner product in $L^2\Lambda^k(H_n) = L^2(H_n) \otimes \Lambda^k$ is such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle_k &= \sum_{I,I'} \langle f_{I,I'}, f'_{I,I'} \rangle + \sum_{J,J'} \langle g_{J,J'}, g'_{J,J'} \rangle \\ &= \langle \omega_1, \omega'_1 \rangle_k + \langle \omega_2, \omega'_2 \rangle_{k-1} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where the inner products of the coefficients are taken in $L^2(H_n)$. In particular the decomposition (1.4) is orthogonal. The formal adjoint of d_{k-1},

$$d^* \quad d^* \quad : \mathcal{D}\Lambda^k(H \quad) \to \mathcal{D}\Lambda^{k-1}(H \quad)$$

is represented by the adjoint matrix of (1.8), i.e.

$$d^* = \begin{pmatrix} d_H^* & -T \\ i(d\theta) & -d_H^* \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1.9}$$

where $i(d\theta) = e(d\theta)^*$ is the interior multiplication operator

$$i(d\theta)\omega = i \sum_{j=1}^{n} i(\bar\beta_j) i(\beta_j)\omega = i \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar\beta_j \lrcorner (\beta_j \lrcorner \omega) .$$

It follows that the Hodge Laplacian on k-forms

$$\Delta_k = dd^* + d^*d$$

is expressed by the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k &= \begin{pmatrix} d_H & e(d\theta) \\ T & -d_H \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_H^* & -T \\ i(d\theta) & -d_H^* \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} d_H^* & -T \\ i(d\theta) & -d_H^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_H & e(d\theta) \\ T & -d_H \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_H - T^2 + e(d\theta)i(d\theta) & \big[d_H^*, e(d\theta)\big] \\ \big[i(d\theta), d_H\big] & \Delta_H - T^2 + i(d\theta)e(d\theta) \end{pmatrix} , \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$\Delta_H = d_H d_H^* + d_H^* d_H .$$

In particular, for $k = 0$ we simply have

$$\Delta_0 = d^*d = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} (B_j \bar B_j + \bar B_j B_j) - T^2 , \tag{1.11}$$

acting on scalar-valued functions.

2. The CR-structure

It is possible to simplify various terms in (1.10) and get a better understanding of that formula by appropriate decompositions of the space of horizontal forms. In order to do so, we must refer to the standard CR-structure on H_n. The operators

$$\partial_b f = \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_j f \, \beta_j , \qquad \bar\partial_b f = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar B_j f \, \bar\beta_j ,$$

initially defined on functions, are naturally extended to forms. They satisfy the following identities:

$$\partial_b^2 = \bar\partial_b^2 = \partial_b \bar\partial_b^* + \bar\partial_b^* \partial_b = \bar\partial_b \partial_b^* + \partial_b^* \bar\partial_b = 0 , \tag{2.1}$$

as well as

(2.2) $$d = \partial + \bar\partial$$

Observe that, by (1.8),

$$d_H^2 = \partial_b \bar\partial_b + \bar\partial_b \partial_b = -Te(d\theta) \ .$$

Setting

$$\Box = \partial_b \partial_b^* + \partial_b^* \partial_b \ , \qquad \overline{\Box} = \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^* + \bar\partial_b^* \bar\partial_b \ ,$$

we obtain that

$$\Delta_H = \Box + \overline{\Box} \ . \tag{2.3}$$

Then $\overline{\Box}$ is the Kohn Laplacian and $\Box$ its complex conjugate. A (p,q)-*form*, $p,q \le n$, is a horizontal form

$$\omega = \sum_{|I|=p\,,|I'|=q} f_{I,I'} \beta^I \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \ .$$

Clearly, the decomposition (1.4) can be further refined, by decomposing ω_1 as a sum of $(p,k-p)$-forms and ω_2 as a sum of $(p,k-1-p)$-forms. The notation $\Lambda^{p,q}$, $\mathcal{D}\Lambda^{p,q}(H_n)$, etc. refers to (p,q)-forms. It is well known [FS] that $\Box$ and $\overline{\Box}$ act as scalar operators on (p,q)-forms (we shall write $\Box_{p,q}$ and $\overline{\Box}_{p,q}$ when appropriate). If

$$L = -\sum_{j=1}^n (B_j \bar B_j + \bar B_j B_j) = -\sum_{j=1}^n (X_j^2 + Y_j^2)$$

is the sub-Laplacian, then

$$\Box_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2} L + i\Big(\frac{n}{2} - p\Big) T \ ; \tag{2.4}$$

similarly,

$$\overline{\Box}_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2} L - i\Big(\frac{n}{2} - q\Big) T \ . \tag{2.5}$$

It follows from (2.3) that

$$\Delta_H = L + i(q-p)T \tag{2.6}$$

on (p,q)-forms.

We next describe the structure of the remaining diagonal terms in (1.10), i.e. $e(d\theta)i(d\theta)$ and its transpose $i(d\theta)e(d\theta)$. Since these operators do not involve any differentiation, their action can be analyzed on exterior forms. Many of the formulas below are also stated in [R1,2] and are derived from the formulas for the Lefshetz decomposition on Kähler manifolds in [W]. For completeness, we give some explicit proofs, and we allow forms of any order, even though we shall later restrict ourselves to 1-forms.

Proposition 2.1. *Consider the following subspaces of* $\Lambda^{p,q}$*,*

$$\begin{aligned} V_j^{p,q} &= e(d\theta)^j \ker_{\Lambda^{p-j,q-j}} i(d\theta) \ , \\ W_\ell^{p,q} &= i(d\theta)^\ell \ker_{\Lambda^{p+\ell,q+\ell}} e(d\theta) \ . \end{aligned}$$

Then $V_j^{p,q}$ *is non-trivial if and only if* $\max\{0,k-n\} \le j \le \min\{p,q\}$*,* $W_\ell^{p,q}$ *is non-trivial if and only if* $\max\{0,n-k\} \le \ell \le \min\{n-p,n-q\}$*, and we have the equality*

$$V_j^{p,q} = W_\ell^{p,q} \ , \qquad \textit{for } \ell = j+n-k = \ell(j) \ .$$

Moreover, $\Lambda^{p,q}$ *is the orthogonal sum of the non-trivial* $V_j^{p,q}$*, and*

$$\begin{aligned} e(d\theta)i(d\theta) &= j(j+1+n-k) = \big(\ell(j)+1\big)\big(\ell(j)+k-n\big) \\ i(d\theta)e(d\theta) &= (j+1)(j+n-k) = \ell(j)\big(\ell(j)+1+k-n\big) \end{aligned}$$

on $V_j^{p,q}$*.*

Proof. Because $\ker i(d\theta) = \big(e(d\theta)\Lambda^{p-1,q-1}\big)^\perp$ inside $\Lambda^{p,q}$, every (p,q)-form ω can be uniquely decomposed into the orthogonal sum

$$\omega = \omega_0 + e(d\theta)\alpha$$

with $i(d\theta)\omega_0 = 0$. Next, we decompose α as

$$\alpha = \omega_1 + e(d\theta)\alpha' \ ,$$

with $i(d\theta)\omega_1 = 0$. The resulting decomposition

$$\omega = \omega_0 + e(d\theta)\omega_1 + e(d\theta)^2\alpha'$$

is also orthogonal, because

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e(d\theta)\omega_1, e(d\theta)^2\alpha'\rangle &= \langle i(d\theta)e(d\theta)\omega_1, e(d\theta)\alpha'\rangle \\ &= (n-k+2)\langle \omega_1, e(d\theta)\alpha'\rangle \\ &= 0 \ . \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this procedure, we end up with writing

$$\omega = \sum_{j=0}^{\min\{p,q\}} e(d\theta)^j \omega_j \ ,$$

with $\omega_j \in \Lambda^{p-j,q-j}$ and $i(d\theta)\omega_j = 0$. A direct computation shows that, when applied to horizontal k-forms,

$$[i(d\theta), e(d\theta)] = (n-k)I \tag{2.7}$$

(see also [W]). Then

$$\begin{aligned} i(d\theta)e(d\theta)^j\omega_j &= [i(d\theta), e(d\theta)^j]\omega_j \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} e(d\theta)^i[i(d\theta), e(d\theta)]e(d\theta)^{j-1-i}\omega_j \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(n-k+2+2i)e(d\theta)^{j-1}\omega_j \\ &= j(n-k+j+1)e(d\theta)^{j-1}\omega_j \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Hence,

$$e(d\theta)i(d\theta)\omega = \sum_{j=0}^{\min\{p,q\}} j(n-k+j+1)e(d\theta)^j\omega_j \ , \tag{2.9}$$

showing that $e(d\theta)i(d\theta)$ diagonalizes w.r. to the decomposition

$$\Lambda^{p,q} = \sum_{j=0}^{\min\{p,q\}} V_j^{p,q} \ .$$

By (2.7), $i(d\theta)e(d\theta)$ also diagonalizes w.r. to the same decomposition, and

$$\begin{aligned} i(d\theta)e(d\theta)\omega &= e(d\theta)i(d\theta)\omega + (n-k)\omega \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\min\{p,q\}} (j+1)(n-k+j)e(d\theta)^j\omega_j \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

But $i(d\theta)e(d\theta)$ is positive semidefinite, so that ω_j must be 0 for $j < k-n$. Therefore $V_j^{p,q}$ can be non-trivial only if $\max\{0, k-n\} \le j \le \min\{p,q\}$. In order to see that this condition is also sufficient, observe that for j in this range, $0 \le p+q-2j \le k - 2\max\{0,k-n\} = \min\{k, 2n-k\} \le n$. Then

$$\omega = \beta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \beta_{p-j} \wedge \bar\beta_{p-j+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar\beta_{p+q-2j}$$

is a non-zero element of $\Lambda^{p-j,q-j}$ satisfying $i(d\theta)\omega = 0$. That $e(d\theta)^j\omega$ is non-zero is trivial for $j=0$ and it follows by induction from (2.8). In conclusion,

$$\Lambda^{p,q} = \sum_{j=\max\{0,k-n\}}^{\min\{p,q\}} V_j^{p,q} \ ,$$

where the summands are non-trivial and mutually orthogonal.

A repetition of the same arguments with the rôles of $e(d\theta)$ and $i(d\theta)$ interchanged shows that

$$\Lambda^{p,q} = \sum_{\ell=\max\{0,n-k\}}^{\min\{n-p,n-q\}} W_\ell^{p,q} \ ,$$

and that $i(d\theta)e(d\theta) = \ell(\ell+k-n+1)I$ on $W_\ell^{p,q}$.

A comparison with the eigenvalues in (2.10) provides the identification of $V_j^{p,q}$ with $W_{\ell(j)}^{p,q}$. □

Consider now the off-diagonal terms

$$\big[i(d\theta), d_H\big] \ , \qquad \big[d_H^*, e(d\theta)\big]$$

in (1.10). They can be simplified using the following identities

Proposition 2.2. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \big[i(d\theta), \partial_b\big] &= -i\bar\partial_b^* \ , & \big[i(d\theta), \bar\partial_b\big] &= i\partial_b^* \\ \big[\partial_b^*, e(d\theta)\big] &= i\bar\partial_b \ , & \big[\bar\partial_b^*, e(d\theta)\big] &= -i\partial_b \ . \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\big[i(d\theta), d_H\big] = i\partial_b^* - i\bar\partial_b^* \ , \qquad \big[d_H^*, e(d\theta)\big] = i\bar\partial_b - i\partial_b \ .$$

Proof. Given $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $I, J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, define $\varepsilon_{j,I}^J$ as 0 unless $j \notin I$ and $\{j\} \cup I = J$, in which case

$$\varepsilon_{j,I}^J = \prod_{i \in I} \operatorname{sgn}(i - j) \ ,$$

i.e. the signature of the permutation that moves j from the left of I to its correct position w.r. to the natural ordering of J. Let $\omega = f\,\beta^I \wedge \bar\beta^{I'}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \big(i(\beta_j)\partial_b + \partial_b i(\beta_j)\big)\omega &= i(\beta_j) \sum_{\ell, J} \varepsilon_{\ell,I}^J B_\ell f\, \beta^J \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \\ &\qquad + \partial_b \sum_M \varepsilon_{j,M}^I f\, \beta^M \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \\ &= \sum_{\ell,J,L} \varepsilon_{\ell,I}^J \varepsilon_{j,L}^J B_\ell f\, \beta^L \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \\ &\qquad + \sum_{\ell,M,L} \varepsilon_{j,M}^I \varepsilon_{\ell,M}^L B_\ell f\, \beta^L \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \\ &= \sum_{\ell,L} \Big(\sum_J \varepsilon_{\ell,I}^J \varepsilon_{j,L}^J + \sum_M \varepsilon_{j,M}^I \varepsilon_{\ell,M}^L \Big) B_\ell f\, \beta^L \wedge \bar\beta^{I'} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Consider the expression

$$\sum_J \varepsilon_{\ell,I}^J \varepsilon_{j,L}^J + \sum_M \varepsilon_{j,M}^I \varepsilon_{\ell,M}^L$$

for fixed ℓ, L. Assume first that $\ell \neq j$. The first sum does not vanish only in one case: $\ell \notin I$, $j \in I$, $L = I \cup \{\ell\} \setminus \{j\}$, with the only non-vanishing term in the sum corresponding to $J = \{\ell\} \cup I$. But this is also the only case when the second sum has a non-vanishing term, the one corresponding to $M = I \cap L$. It takes a few moments to verify that, if this is the case, the two terms have opposite signs, so that the total expression is always 0 for $\ell \neq j$.

Assume now that $\ell = j \in I$. The first term is 0, and the second term is also 0 unless $M = I \setminus \{j\}$ and $L = I$. In this case the total expression gives 1. Finally, if $\ell = j \notin I$, the first term is 1 and the second is 0. The conclusion is that the expression under consideration equals 1 if $\ell = j$ and $L = I$ and 0 otherwise. Hence

$$\big(i(\beta_j)\partial_b + \partial_b i(\beta_j)\big)\omega = B_j f\, \beta^I \wedge \bar\beta^{I'}$$

A similar computation shows that

$$\big(i(\bar\beta_j)\partial_b + \partial_b i(\bar\beta_j)\big)\omega = 0\ .$$

Putting these identities together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} i(d\theta)\partial_b\omega &= i\sum_{j=1}^n i(\bar\beta_j)i(\beta_j)\partial_b\omega \\ &= i\sum_{j=1}^n B_j f i(\bar\beta_j)\beta^I\wedge\bar\beta^{I'} - i\sum_{j=1}^n i(\bar\beta_j)\partial_b i(\beta_j)\omega \\ &= i\sum_{j=1}^n B_j f i(\bar\beta_j)\beta^I\wedge\bar\beta^{I'} + i\sum_{j=1}^n \partial_b i(\bar\beta_j)i(\beta_j)\omega \\ &= -i\bar\partial_b^*\omega + \partial_b i(d\theta)\omega\ . \end{aligned}$$

This gives the first identity in the statement. Taking complex conjugates and transposes, the other three follow. □

In combination with the formula preceding (2.3), this immediately gives

Corollary 2.3. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \Box\bar\partial_b &= \bar\partial_b\Box - iT\bar\partial_b, \\ \overline{\Box}\partial_b &= \partial_b\overline{\Box} + iT\partial_b, \end{aligned}$$

hence, by duality,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar\partial_b^*\Box &= \Box\bar\partial_b^* - iT\bar\partial_b^*, \\ \partial_b^*\overline{\Box} &= \overline{\Box}\partial_b^* + iT\partial_b^*. \end{aligned}$$

3. Spectral multipliers of $i^{-1}T$ and L

The operators $i^{-1}T$ and L admit commuting self-adjoint extensions on $L^2(H_n)$, and their joint spectrum is the *Heisenberg fan* $F_n \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. If

$$\ell_m = \{(\lambda,\xi) : \xi = (n+2m)|\lambda|, \lambda\in\mathbb{R}\}\ ,$$

then

$$F_n = \overline{\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \ell_m}\ .$$

The variable λ corresponds to $i^{-1}T$ and ξ to L, i.e., calling $dE(\lambda,\xi)$ the spectral measure on F_n,

$$i^{-1}T = \int_{F_n} \lambda\, dE(\lambda,\xi)\ , \qquad L = \int_{F_n} \xi\, dE(\lambda,\xi)\ .$$

It follows from the Plancherel formula that the spectral measure of the vertical half-line $\{(0,\xi) : \xi \geq 0\} \subset F_n$ is zero. A spectral multiplier is therefore a function $\mu(\lambda,\xi)$ on F_n whose restriction to each ℓ_m is measurable w.r.t. to $d\lambda$. Later on we shall use results from [MRS1,2] concerning L^p-boundedness of spectral multipliers. For the moment, we use these facts to discuss L^2-boundedness of certain operators that will appear in the next Section, together with some $L^p - L^q$-estimates for

Lemma 3.1. *The operators*

$$L^r(\Delta_0 + i\alpha T)^{-r} \ , \qquad T^{2r}(\Delta_0 + i\alpha T)^{-r}$$

are bounded on $L^2(H_n)$ *for* $|\alpha| < n$ *and* $r > 0$.

Proof. By (1.11), $\Delta_0 = L - T^2$. Hence we just need to observe that the multipliers

$$\mu_1(\lambda, \xi) = \frac{\xi^r}{(\xi + \lambda^2 - \alpha\lambda)^r} \ , \qquad \mu_2(\lambda, \xi) = \frac{\lambda^{2r}}{(\xi + \lambda^2 - \alpha\lambda)^r}$$

are bounded on F_n. □

The *Cauchy-Szegö projection* C is the orthogonal projection of $L^2(H_n)$ onto the Hardy space $H^2(H_n)$, consisting of the L^2-functions f such that $\bar\partial_b f = 0$. It is a well-known fact (see [S, Ch. XIII]) that $H^2(H_n)$ is also the null-space of

$$L - inT = 2\overline{\Box}_{0,0} = 2\bar\partial_b^*\bar\partial_b = -2\sum_{j=1}^n B_j \bar B_j \ .$$

What is relevant for us at this stage is that $C = \mu(i^{-1}T, L)$, where μ is equal to 1 on the half-line $\xi = -n\lambda$, with $\lambda < 0$, and 0 elsewhere. In the same way, the complex conjugate $\bar C$ of C projects $L^2(H_n)$ onto the null space of ∂_b, which is the same as the null space of $L + inT = 2\Box_{0,0}$, and its multiplier equals 1 on the half-line $\xi = n\lambda$, with $\lambda > 0$, and 0 elsewhere. The next result follows easily.

Lemma 3.2. *The operators*

$$L^r(L - inT)^{-r}(I - C) \ , \qquad L^r(L + inT)^{-r}(I - \bar C)$$

are bounded on L^2.

We pass now to the $L^p - L^q$-estimates.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $\mu(\lambda, \xi)$ *be a smooth function defined on an angle* $D_\delta = \{(\lambda, \xi) : \xi > (n-\delta)|\lambda|\}$, *with* $\delta > 0$, *and homogeneous of degree* $-d$, *with* $0 < d < n+1$. *Then* $\mu(i^{-1}T, L)$ *is well-defined and bounded from* $L^p(H_n)$ *to* $L^q(H_n)$ *for* $1 < p < q < \infty$ *and* $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{d}{n+1}$.

Proof. It follows from [G, AD] that $\mu(i^{-1}T, L)f = f * K$, where K is smooth away from the origin and homogeneous of degree $-(2n + 2 - 2d)$. The conclusion follows from the generalized Young inequality. □

4. Decomposition of $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ under the action of Δ_1

For $k = 1$, the conclusions of Sections 1 and 2 lead us to write the generic 1-form ω as

$$\omega = \omega_+ + \omega_- + h\theta \ ,$$

where ω_+ is a $(1, 0)$-form and ω_- is a $(0, 1)$-form. Then

$$\Delta_1 \begin{pmatrix} \omega_+ \\ \omega_- \\ \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_0 - iT & 0 & -i\partial_b \\ 0 & \Delta_0 + iT & i\bar\partial_b \\ \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_+ \\ \omega_- \\ \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{4.1}$$

Obviously, Δ_1, initially defined on $\mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$, is essentially self-adjoint, and the domain of its self-adjoint (Friedrichs) extension is

$$\operatorname{dom}\Delta_1 = \left\{\omega \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n) : \Delta_1\omega \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)\right\} ,$$

where $\Delta_1\omega$ is meant in the sense of distributions.

If $\omega \in \mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$ is exact, say $\omega = d\varphi$, then

$$\Delta_1\omega = dd^*d\varphi = d\Delta_0\varphi ,$$

i.e. d intertwines the action of Δ_1 on ω with the action of Δ_0 on φ. We shall show that a similar statement holds for exact L^2-forms, with d replaced by a modified intertwining operator which is L^2-bounded. Before doing so, we must make some preliminary remarks.

Lemma 4.1. *The operator $R = d\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is isometric from $L^2(H_n)$ to its image in $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, $L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $T\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are bounded on $L^2(H_n)$. We recall that the Riesz transforms $B_jL^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\bar{B}_jL^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are also bounded on L^2. Since

$$B_j\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (B_jL^{-\frac{1}{2}})(L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}) ,$$

it follows that $B_j\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is L^2-bounded, and similarly for $\bar{B}_j\Delta_0^{-1}$.

Hence, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R\varphi\|_2^2 &= \|d\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi\|_2^2 \\ &= \langle \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}d^*d\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, \varphi\rangle \\ &= \|\varphi\|_2^2 . \qquad \square \end{aligned}$$

We say that $\omega \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ is *exact* if there exists $u \in \mathcal{D}'(H_n)$ such that $\omega = du$ in the sense of distributions (componentwise). In the same sense we shall talk later on of ∂_b*-exact* forms or of $\bar\partial_b$*-exact* forms.

Lemma 4.2. *Let r be such that $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{2n+2}$. If $\omega \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ is exact, then $\omega = dv$, in the sense of distributions, for some $v \in L^r(H_n)$.*

Proof. By definition, there is $u \in \mathcal{D}'(H_n)$ such that $\omega = du$. Define

$$v = \Delta_0^{-1}d^*\omega = L^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}L^{\frac{1}{2}})R^*\omega ,$$

where $R^* = \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}d^*$ is the adjoint of the operator R in Lemma 4.1. Then R^* is L^2-bounded, and $\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}L^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is too, by the spectral theorem. Finally, $L^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is bounded from L^2 to L^r, e.g. by Lemma 3.3. Hence $v \in L^r(H_n)$. Moreover,

$$dv = RR^*\omega \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n) ,$$

and

$$\Delta_0 v = d^*\omega = \Delta_0 u .$$

Observe now that

$$\Delta_1(\omega - dv) = \Delta_1 d(u - v) = d\Delta_0(u - v) = 0 .$$

The conclusion will follow from the next lemma. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *The Hodge Laplacian Δ_1 is injective on $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$.*

Proof. Assume that $\omega = \omega_+ + \omega_- + h\theta$ satisfies $\Delta_1\omega = 0$ in the sense of distributions. By (4.1), this means that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_0 - iT)\omega_+ &= i\partial_b h \ , \\ (\Delta_0 + iT)\omega_- &= -i\bar\partial_b h \ , \\ (\Delta_0 + n)h &= -i\partial_b^*\omega_+ + i\bar\partial_b^*\omega_- \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

We multiply the first equation in (4.2) by $(\Delta_0 - iT)\partial_b^*$, and the second equation by $(\Delta_0 + iT)\bar\partial_b^*$. Using the identities

$$\partial_b^*(\Delta_0 - iT) = (\Delta_0 + iT)\partial_b^* \ , \qquad \bar\partial_b^*(\Delta_0 + iT) = (\Delta_0 - iT)\bar\partial_b^*$$

– easily deduced from (2.4) and (2.5) –, and performing some simple computations, we obtain that

$$(\Delta_0^2 + T^2)(\Delta_0 + n)h = \big(\Delta_0^2 + T^2(\Delta_0 + n)\big)h \ ,$$

i.e.

$$\Delta_0^2(\Delta_0 + n - 1)h = 0 \ .$$

Since the zero set of the multiplier corresponding to the operator on the left-hand side is the origin, and it has measure zero in the Heisenberg fan, this implies that $h = 0$. □

Proposition 4.4. *The operator $P_1 = RR^*$ on $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace of exact L^2-forms. In particular, this subspace is closed. Moreover, P_1 maps* dom Δ_1 *into itself.*

Proof. Clearly, P_1 is self-adjoint. Assume that $\omega \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ is exact. By Lemma 4.2, there is $v \in L^r(H_n)$ such that $\omega = dv$. Let χ be a non-negative, smooth function on H_n with compact support, equal to 1 on a neighborhood of the origin, and define $\chi_j(z,t) = \chi(z/j, t/j^2)$. Let also $\{\varphi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an approximate identity in $\mathcal{D}(H_n)$. If

$$v_j = \varphi_j * (\chi_j v) \ ,$$

then $v_j \to v$ in $L^r(H_n)$. Moreover,

$$dv_j = \varphi_j * (\chi_j\omega) + \varphi_j * (v\,d\chi_j) \ ,$$

if we interpret the concolution $\varphi_j * \alpha$ of φ_j with a 1-form α componentwise.

If $|\cdot|$ denotes a homogeneous norm on H_n,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_j * (v\,d\chi_j)\|_2 &\le \|v\,d\chi_j\|_2 \\ &\le \frac{C}{j}\Big(\int_{|x|\sim j} |v|^2\Big)^{\frac12} \\ &\le \frac{C}{j}(j^{2n+2})^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}\Big(\int_{|x|\sim j} |v|^r\Big)^{\frac1r} \\ &= C\Big(\int |v|^r\Big)^{\frac1r} \ , \end{aligned}$$

and it tends to zero as j tends to infinity. Hence $dv_j \to dv$ in $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$.

Given $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle P_1\omega, \sigma\rangle &= \langle dv, P_1\sigma\rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle dv_j, P_1\sigma\rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle v_j, d^*d\Delta_0^{-1}d^*\sigma\rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle v_j, d^*\sigma\rangle \\ &= \langle v, d^*\sigma\rangle \\ &= \langle dv, \sigma\rangle \ ,\end{aligned}$$

showing that $P_1\omega = \omega$.

On the other hand, if $\omega = P_1\omega'$, let $v = \Delta_0^{-1}d^*\omega' \in L^r(H_n)$, as in the proof of Lemma 4.2. If $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle dv, \sigma\rangle &= \langle \Delta_0^{-1}d^*\omega', d^*\sigma\rangle \\ &= \langle \omega', P_1\sigma\rangle \ ,\end{aligned}$$

so that $dv = P_1\omega' = \omega$. To prove the last part of the statement, take again $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$. Then

$$\Delta_1 P_1\sigma = \Delta_1(d\Delta_0^{-1}d^*\sigma) = dd^*d\Delta_0^{-1}d^*\sigma = dd^*\sigma \ ,$$

and

$$P_1\Delta_1\sigma = d\Delta_0^{-1}d^*\Delta_1\sigma = d\Delta_0^{-1}d^*dd^*\sigma = dd^*\sigma \ .$$

Therefore $\Delta_1 P_1 = P_1\Delta_1$ on $\mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$. For a general $\sigma \in \operatorname{dom}\Delta_1$, we take a sequence of forms $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$ such that $\sigma_j \to \sigma$ and $\Delta_1\sigma_j \to \Delta_1\sigma$ in the L^2-norm. Then $P_1\sigma_j \to P_1\sigma$, and

$$P_1\Delta_1\sigma = \lim_{j\to\infty} P_1\Delta_1\sigma_j = \lim_{j\to\infty} \Delta_1 P_1\sigma_j \ .$$

Since Δ_1 is closed, $P_1\sigma \in \operatorname{dom}\Delta_1$, and $P_1\Delta_1\sigma = \Delta_1 P_1\sigma$. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Let V_1 be the range of P_1 in $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$, i.e. the space of exact L^2-forms. Then R maps* $\operatorname{dom}\Delta_0$ *onto* $(\operatorname{dom}\Delta_1) \cap V_1$*, and intertwines the action of Δ_0 with that of Δ_1, i.e.*

$$R\Delta_0 = \Delta_1 R \ ,$$

on $\operatorname{dom}\Delta_0$.

Proof. If $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1 R\varphi &= (dd^* + d^*d)d\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi \\ &= d(d^*d)\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi \\ &= d\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_0\varphi \\ & R\Delta\varphi\end{aligned}$$

An adaptation of the proof of Proposition 4.4 shows that $R(\operatorname{dom}\Delta_0) \subseteq \operatorname{dom}\Delta_1$, and that $R\Delta_0 = \Delta_1 R$ on $\operatorname{dom}\Delta_0$.

Conversely, take $\omega \in (\operatorname{dom}\Delta_1) \cap V_1$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H_n)$. Since $\mathcal{D}\Lambda^1(H_n)$ is a core for Δ_1, we find a sequence $\{\omega_j\}_j$ in this space such that $\omega = \lim \omega_j$ and $\Delta_1\omega = \lim \Delta_1\omega_j$ in L^2. Moreover, $\Delta_1 R\varphi = R\Delta_0\varphi \in L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\langle R^*\Delta_1\omega, \varphi\rangle &= \langle \Delta_1\omega, R\varphi\rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle \Delta_1\omega_j, R\varphi\rangle = \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle \omega_j, \Delta_1 R\varphi\rangle \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \langle \omega_j, R\Delta_0\varphi\rangle \\ &= \langle \omega, R\Delta_0\varphi\rangle \\ &= \langle \Delta_0 R^*\omega, \varphi\rangle \ ,\end{aligned}$$

showing that $\Delta_0(R^*\omega)$, defined in the sense of distributions, is equal to $R^*\Delta_1\omega$. In particular, $R^*\omega \in \operatorname{dom}\Delta_0$.

Since $\omega = P_1\omega = R(R^*\omega)$, it follows that $\omega \in R(\operatorname{dom}\Delta_0)$. □

We are so led to study Δ_1 on $V_1^\perp$, the orthogonal complement of the exact L^2-forms. This is the space of co-closed L^2-forms, i.e. the forms ω such that $d^*\omega = 0$. We denote by V_2^+ (resp. V_2^-) the space of co-closed $(1,0)$ forms (resp. $(0,1)$ forms).

Proposition 4.6. *For $\omega \in V_2^\pm$, $\Delta_1\omega = (\Delta_0 \mp iT)\omega$ in the sense of distributions.*

Proof. If $\omega \in V_2^+$, then $\partial_b^*\omega = d^*\omega = 0$. The conclusion follows from (4.1), and similarly for V_2^-. □

Observe that, on H_1, V_2^+ consists of the $(1,0)$-forms $f\beta$ with $\partial_b^*(f\beta) = -\bar{B}f = 0$. Therefore, on V_2^+,

$$\Delta_0 - iT = -(2B\bar{B} + T^2) = -T^2 \ .$$

In the same way, $\Delta_0 + iT = -T^2$ on V_2^-.

We want to describe now the orthogonal projections $P_2^\pm$ from $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ onto $V_2^\pm$. We look at P_2^+ as the composition of the orthogonal projection Q^+ from $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ onto $L^2\Lambda^{1,0}(H_n)$ followed by the orthogonal projection from $L^2\Lambda^{1,0}(H_n)$ onto V_2^+ (and similarly for P_2^-). It is immediate to verify that

$$Q^\pm(\omega_+ + \omega_- + h\theta) = \omega_\pm \ .$$

In order to describe the second factor in the decomposition of P_2^+, it is preferable to consider its complementary projection, from $L^2\Lambda^{1,0}(H_n)$ onto the orthogonal complement $(V_2^+)^\perp$. Since V_2^+ is the null space of ∂_b^*, $(V_2^+)^\perp$ is the closure of the space of ∂_b-exact L^2-$(1,0)$-forms. In the same way, $(V_2^-)^\perp$ is the closure of the space of $\bar\partial_b$-exact L^2-$(0,1)$-forms.

These projections involve the operators $\square_{0,0}, \overline{\square}_{0,0}$ in (2.4) and (2.5),

$$\square_{0,0} = \partial_b^*\partial_b = \frac{1}{2}(L + inT) \ , \qquad \overline{\square}_{0,0} = \bar\partial_b^*\bar\partial_b = \frac{1}{2}(L - inT) \ .$$

As there will be no confusion from now on, we drop the double subscript and simply write $\square$ and $\overline{\square}$. As we have observed already,

$$\square u = 0 \iff \partial_b u = 0 \ , \qquad \overline{\square} u = 0 \iff \bar\partial_b u = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

Consequently, the image in $L^2(H_n)$ of ∂_b^* is contained in $\big(\ker\Box\big)^\perp$ and the image in $L^2(H_n)$ of $\bar\partial_b^*$ is contained in $\big(\ker\overline{\Box}\big)^\perp$.

In particular,

$$\partial_b^* = (I-\bar C)\partial_b^* \ , \qquad \bar\partial_b^* = (I-C)\bar\partial_b^* \ . \tag{4.4}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 and boundedness of the Riesz transforms that

$$\begin{aligned} \Box^{-\frac12}\partial_b^* &= \sqrt2\Big(L^{\frac12}(L+inT)^{-\frac12}(I-\bar C)\Big)\left(L^{-\frac12}\partial_b^*\right) \ , \\ \overline{\Box}^{-\frac12}\bar\partial_b^* &= \sqrt2\Big(L^{\frac12}(L-inT)^{-\frac12}(I-C)\Big)\left(L^{-\frac12}\bar\partial_b^*\right) \end{aligned}$$

are well defined and bounded from $L^2\Lambda^{1,0}(H_n)$ (resp. $L^2\Lambda^{0,1}(H_n)$) to $L^2(H_n)$. If the factors $I-C$ and $I-\bar C$ are superfluous in the above formulas because of (4.4), the same is not true for the adjoint operators, $\partial_b\Box^{-\frac12}(I-\bar C)$ and $\bar\partial_b\overline{\Box}^{-\frac12}(I-C)$.

We conclude that the four operators we will be dealing with,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal R &= \partial_b\Box^{-\frac12}(I-\bar C) \ , \qquad & \bar{\mathcal R} &= \bar\partial_b\overline{\Box}^{-\frac12}(I-C) \ , \\ \mathcal R^* &= \Box^{-\frac12}\partial_b^* \ , \qquad & \bar{\mathcal R}^* &= \overline{\Box}^{-\frac12}\bar\partial_b^* \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

are L^2-bounded.

Proposition 4.7. *The operator $\mathcal R\mathcal R^*$ is the orthogonal projection from $L^2\Lambda^{1,0}(H_n)$ onto the subspace of ∂_b-exact forms, and $\bar{\mathcal R}\bar{\mathcal R}^*$ is the orthogonal projection from $L^2\Lambda^{0,1}(H_n)$ onto the subspace of $\bar\partial_b$-exact forms. In particular, these two subspaces are closed. Moreover, $\mathcal R^*\mathcal R = I-\bar C$, $\bar{\mathcal R}^*\bar{\mathcal R} = I-C$.*

Proof. The argument is the same as in the proof of Proposition 4.4. The only substantial difference is that we must write

$$\Box^{-1}\partial_b^* = \Box^{-\frac12}(I-\bar C)\Box^{-\frac12}\partial_b^* \ ,$$

and notice that Lemma 3.3 can be applied to the factor $\Box^{-\frac12}(I-\bar C)$. In fact this operator can be realized as $\mu(i^{-1}T, L)$, if μ is an appropriately chosen smooth function on some angle D_δ, homogeneous of degree $-1/2$, equal to $(\xi-n\lambda)^{-\frac12}$ on F_n except for the half-line $\xi = n\lambda$, $\lambda>0$, where it is set equal to 0. $\Box$

Corollary 4.8. *The orthogonal projections $P_2^\pm$ from $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ onto $V_2^\pm$ are given by*

$$P_2^+ = (I-\mathcal R\mathcal R^*)Q^+ \ , \qquad P_2^- = (I-\bar{\mathcal R}\bar{\mathcal R}^*)Q^- \ .$$

They map $\mathrm{dom}\,\Delta_1$ *into itself.*

5. DECOMPOSITION OF THE ACTION OF Δ_1 ON V_3

It remains to describe the action of Δ_1 on the orthogonal complement V_3 of $V_1\oplus V_2^+\oplus V_2^-$ in $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$. Notice that $\Delta_1(V_3\cap\mathrm{dom}\,\Delta_1)\subset V_3$. It follows from Proposition 4.4 and Corollary 4.8 that

In order to describe V_3 we take a detour that has the advantage of making this space somewhat more explicit. We forget for a moment that V_1 has been analyzed already, and we look at the full orthogonal complement of V_2,

$$V_2^\perp = \big\{\omega \,:\, \omega = \omega_+ + \omega_- + h\theta\,, \omega_+ \text{ is } \partial_b - \text{exact}\,,\ \omega_- \text{ is } \bar\partial_b - \text{exact}\big\}\ .$$

Since ω_+ is ∂_b-exact, let $u = \mathcal{R}^*\omega_+$. Then $u \in L^2$ and $\bar{C}u = 0$. Moreover, we can recover ω_+ from u, since $\omega_+ = \mathcal{R}u$, by Prop. 4.7. Analogously, we set $v = \bar{\mathcal{R}}^*\omega_-$ so that $v \in L^2$, $Cv = 0$ and $\omega_- = \bar{\mathcal{R}}v$. Thus, we are lead to consider the closed subspace of $\big(L^2\big)^3$

$$W = \big\{(u,v,h) \in \big(L^2\big)^3 \,:\, \bar{C}u = Cv = 0\big\}\,.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Define* $\Gamma : W \to V_2^\perp$ *by setting*

$$\Gamma(u,v,h) = \mathcal{R}u + \bar{\mathcal{R}}v + h\theta\ .$$

Then Γ *is unitary and its inverse is given by*

$$\Gamma^*(\omega) = \big(\mathcal{R}^*\omega_+, \bar{\mathcal{R}}^*\omega_-, h\big)\,.$$

Proof. By definition of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ it is clear that Γ maps W into $V_2^\perp$. Next, by Proposition 4.7,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Gamma(u,v,h), \Gamma(u',v',h')\rangle &= \langle\mathcal{R}u, \mathcal{R}u'\rangle + \langle\bar{\mathcal{R}}v, \bar{\mathcal{R}}v'\rangle + \langle h, h'\rangle\\ &= \langle\mathcal{R}^*\mathcal{R}u, u'\rangle + \langle\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*\bar{\mathcal{R}}v, v'\rangle + \langle h, h'\rangle\\ &= \langle(u,v,h), (u',v',h')\rangle\ ,\end{aligned}$$

which shows that Γ preserves the inner product. The previous discussion shows that $\Gamma^*\Gamma = \mathrm{Id}_W$, and furthermore Γ is onto since $\Gamma\Gamma^* = \mathrm{Id}_{V_2^\perp}$. $\square$

We now set

$$D_1 = \Gamma^*\Delta_1\Gamma\,,$$

being $\operatorname{dom}(D_1) = \Gamma^*\big(\operatorname{dom}(\Delta_1) \cap V_2^\perp\big)$. We compute D_1 explicitely. Writing $\Gamma(u,v,h) = \omega(u,v,h)$ and recalling that Δ_1 is given by (4.1), we have

$$\Delta_1\omega(u,v,h) = \omega(u',v',h')\,,$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{R}u' = (\Delta_0 - iT)\mathcal{R}u - i\partial_b h\\ \bar{\mathcal{R}}v' = (\Delta_0 + iT)\bar{\mathcal{R}}v + i\bar\partial_b h\\ \quad h' = i\partial_b^*\mathcal{R}u - i\bar\partial_b^*\bar{\mathcal{R}}v + (\Delta_0 + n)h\,. \end{cases}$$

By applying $\mathcal{R}^*$ to the first equation and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*$ to the second one and using the commutation relations from Corollary 2.3 we obtain

$$\begin{cases} u' = (\Delta_0 + iT)u - i\Box^{\frac12}h\\ v' = (\Delta_0 - iT)v + i\overline{\Box}^{\frac12}h\\ h' = i\Box^{\frac12}u - i\overline{\Box}^{\frac12}v + (\Delta_0 + n)h \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_0 + iT & 0 & -i\square^{\frac12} \\ 0 & \Delta_0 - iT & i\overline{\square}^{\frac12} \\ i\square^{\frac12} & -i\overline{\square}^{\frac12} & \Delta_0 + n \end{pmatrix} .$$

Consider the corresponding matrix of spectral multipliers

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} \xi + \lambda^2 - \lambda & 0 & -i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi - n\lambda)} \\ 0 & \xi + \lambda^2 + \lambda & i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi + n\lambda)} \\ i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi - n\lambda)} & -i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi + n\lambda)} & \xi + \lambda^2 + n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\xi + \lambda^2)I + \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda & 0 & -i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi - n\lambda)} \\ 0 & \lambda & i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi + n\lambda)} \\ i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi - n\lambda)} & -i\sqrt{\frac12(\xi + n\lambda)} & n \end{pmatrix} . \end{aligned}$$

Diagonalization of d_1 will have the following implication. Assume that

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} a_1(\lambda, \xi) \\ a_2(\lambda, \xi) \\ a_3(\lambda, \xi) \end{pmatrix}$$

is a unit eigenvector of d_1 of eigenvalue $\mu(\lambda, \xi)$. If we take a scalar function $f \in L^2(H_n)$ such that

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} a_1(i^{-1}T, L)f \\ a_2(i^{-1}T, L)f \\ a_3(i^{-1}T, L)f \end{pmatrix} \in W \ ,$$

then $D_1 F = \mu(i^{-1}T, L)F$.

Lemma 5.2. *The eigenvalues of* d_1 *are* $\xi + \lambda^2$ *and* $\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}}$. *The matrix entries of the orthogonal projections to the eigenspaces of* d_1 *are functions of* (λ, ξ) *which are bounded on the Heisenberg fan* F_n.

Proof. We compute the eigenvalues of $m_1 = d_1 - (\xi + \lambda^2)I$:

$$\det(m_1 - \mu I) = -\mu^3 + n\mu^2 + (\xi + \lambda^2)\mu \,,$$

so that m_1 has eigenvalues

$$\mu = 0 \,, \qquad \mu_\pm = \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}} \,.$$

Next we determine the eigenvectors and the orthogonal projections onto the eigenspaces of m_1.

A unit eigenvector for $\mu = 0$ is

$$v_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac12(\xi - n\lambda)} \\ \sqrt{\frac12(\xi + n\lambda)} \end{pmatrix} .$$

In order to describe the eigenvectors corresponding to the eigengvalues $\mu_\pm$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} a = a(\lambda,\xi) &= \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}} \\ q^{\varepsilon}_{\delta} = q^{\varepsilon}_{\delta}(\lambda,\xi) &= a + \varepsilon\frac{n}{2} + \delta\lambda\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where $\varepsilon, \delta = \pm 1$. Notice that the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} q^+_+ q^-_- &= \xi - n\lambda \\ q^+_- q^-_+ &= \xi + n\lambda \\ q^+_+ + q^-_- &= q^+_- + q^-_+ = 2a \\ q^+_+ q^-_+ &= (a+\lambda)^2 - \frac{n^2}{4} \\ q^+_- q^-_- &= (a-\lambda)^2 - \frac{n^2}{4} \\ q^+_+ q^+_- &= (a+\frac{n}{2})^2 - \lambda^2 \\ q^-_+ q^-_- &= (a-\frac{n}{2})^2 - \lambda^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Since

$$m_1 - \mu_\pm I =$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} -\lambda - \frac{n}{2} \mp \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}} & 0 & -i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(\xi - n\lambda)} \\ 0 & \lambda - \frac{n}{2} \mp \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}} & i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(\xi + n\lambda)} \\ i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(\xi - n\lambda)} & -i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(\xi + n\lambda)} & \frac{n}{2} \mp \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}} \end{pmatrix},$$

a unit eigenvector relative to μ_+ is

$$v_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a(a+\frac{n}{2})}} \begin{pmatrix} -i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}q^+_- q^-_-} \\ i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}q^+_+ q^-_+} \\ \sqrt{q^+_+ q^+_-} \end{pmatrix},$$

where we have used the identities (5.3) to obtain the normalizing factor.

Similar computations show that a unit eigenvector relative to μ_- is

$$v_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a(a-\frac{n}{2})}} \begin{pmatrix} i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}q^+_+ q^-_+} \\ -i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}q^+_- q^-_-} \\ \sqrt{q^-_+ q^-_-} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The orthogonal projections corresponding to the eigenvectors above are represented by the matrices $p_0 = v_0 v_0^*$, $p_\pm = v_\pm v_\pm^*$. Clearly these three matrices satisfy $p + p + p = I$, and their entries are bounded by 1 on the fan F. □

Next, we wish to decompose W as the direct sum of subspaces in such a way that D_1 acts as a scalar operator on any of these subspaces. Recalling the definition (5.2) of a and q_δ^ε, we set

$$\mathcal{A} = \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \frac{n^2}{4}} = a(i^{-1}T, L) \ , \qquad Q_\delta^\varepsilon = \mathcal{A} + \varepsilon\frac{n}{2} - \delta iT = q_\delta^\varepsilon(i^{-1}T, L)\,, \tag{5.6}$$

where $\varepsilon, \delta = \pm 1$. By (5.3) and (2.4), (2.5) we then have the following identities

$$\begin{aligned} Q_+^+ Q_-^- &= 2\Box \\ Q_+^- Q_-^+ &= 2\overline{\Box}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Proposition 5.3. *Define S_0, $S_\pm$ resp. to be the operators from $L^2(H_n)$ to $L^2(H_n)^3$ having v_0, $v_\pm$ resp. as spectral multipliers. Then S_0 and S_+ map $L^2(H_n)$ isometrically into W, and S_- maps $L_0^2(H_n) = \{f \in L^2(H_n) : Cf = \bar{C}f = 0\}$ isometrically into W.*

Moreover, W is the orthogonal sum of $W_0 = S_0L^2(H_n)$, $W_+ = S_+L^2(H_n)$, $W_- = S_-L_0^2(H_n)$. More precisely, every $(u, v, h) \in W$ decomposes uniquely as

$$(u, v, h) = S_0f_0 + S_+f_+ + S_-f_- \ ,$$

with $f_0 = S_0^*(u, v, h) \in L^2(H_n)$, $f_+ = S_+^*(u, v, h) \in L^2(H_n)$, and $f_- = S_-^*(u, v, h) \in L_0^2(H_n)$. Finally, the operators $P_0 = S_0S_0^*$, $P_\pm = S_\pm S_\pm^*$ on W whose spectral multipliers are p_0, $p_\pm$ resp., are the orthogonal projections onto W_0, $W_\pm$ respectively.

Proof. We know that, for every fixed $(\lambda, \xi) \in F_n$,

$$I = p_0 + p_+ + p_- = v_0v_0^* + v_+v_+^* + v_-v_-^* \quad \text{on } \mathbb{C}^3,$$

where p_0, p_+, p_- are pairwise orthogonal projections. By the spectral theorem, this implies

$$I = P_0 + P_+ + P_- = S_0S_0^* + S_+S_+^* + S_-S_-^* \quad \text{on } L^2(H_n)^3,$$

where P_0, P_+ and P_- are pairwise orthogonal projections. Moreover, since the spectral multiplier for $S_0^*S_0$ is $v_0^*v_0 = ||v_0||^2 = 1$, S_0 is isometric, and the same is true for S_+, S_-, by similar reasoning.

Thus, every $(u, v, h) \in L^2(H_n)^3$ uniquely decomposes as the orthogonal sum

$$(u, v, h) = S_0f_0 + S_+f_+ + S_-f_-,$$

with $f_0 = S_0^*(u, v, h), f_+ = S_+^*(u, v, h), f_- = S_-^*(u, v, h) \in L^2(H_n)$. There remains to prove that the mapping

$$\mathcal{T} : (f_0, f_+, f_-) \mapsto S_0f_0 + S_+f_+ + S_-f_-,$$

when restricted to the subspace $\Omega = L^2(H_n)\times L^2(H_n)\times L_0^2(H_n)$, maps into and onto W. To this end, notice that the first components in v_0 and v_+ vanish for $\xi = n\lambda$. Together with the fact that the spectral multiplier of $\bar{C}$ is the characteristic function of the set where $\xi = n\lambda$, this implies that, if (u, v, h) equals S_0f_0 or S_+f_+, then $\bar{C}u = 0$. A similar argument shows that $Cu = 0$. The same conclusion holds for

$(u, v, h) = S_- f_-$ if we impose that $Cf_- = \bar{C} f_- = 0$, i.e. $f_- \in L^2_0(H_n)$. Thus $\mathcal{T}(\Omega) \subset W$.

Conversely, given $(u, v, h) \in W$, define $f_0, f_\pm \in L^2(H_n)$ as in the statement. In particular,

$$f_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A} - \frac{n}{2})}} \left(i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} Q^+_+ Q^-_+} u - i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} Q^+_- Q^-_-} v + \sqrt{Q^-_+ Q^-_-} h \right) .$$

From the identities

$$\bar{C} u = 0 \ , \qquad C v = 0 \ , \qquad \bar{C} Q^-_- = 0 \ , \qquad C Q^-_+ = 0 \ ,$$

we conclude that $\bar{C} f_- = C f_- = 0$, hence $(f_0, f_+, f_-) \in \Omega$. $\square$

Remark. It can be proved that it is possible to give another description of the three subspaces of W as

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= \left\{ (u, v, h) \in W \ : Tu = \square^{\frac{1}{2}} h, \ Tv = \overline{\square}^{\frac{1}{2}} h \right\} \\ W_+ &= \left\{ (u, v, h) \in W \ : Q^+_+ u = -i \square^{\frac{1}{2}} h, \ Q^+_- v = i \overline{\square}^{\frac{1}{2}} h \right\} \\ W_- &= \left\{ (u, v, h) \in W \ : Q^-_- u = i \square^{\frac{1}{2}} h, \ Q^-_+ v = -i \overline{\square}^{\frac{1}{2}} h \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Composing with Γ, this decomposition of W gives rise to an orthogonal decomposition of $V_2^\perp$. Notice that, if $(u, v, h) \in W_0$, i.e.

$$u = \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \square^{\frac{1}{2}} f \ , \qquad v = \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\square}^{\frac{1}{2}} f \ , \qquad h = T \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} f \ ,$$

for some $f \in L^2(H_n)$, then

$$\Gamma(u, v, h) = \mathcal{R} \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \square^{\frac{1}{2}} f + \bar{\mathcal{R}} \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\square}^{\frac{1}{2}} f + T \Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} f \theta = Rf \ ,$$

so that $\Gamma W_0 = V_1$, the space of exact forms.

Define

$$V_3^\pm = \Gamma(W_\pm) \ .$$

Proposition 5.4. *The orthogonal complement of* $V_1 \oplus V_2$ *in* $L^2 \Lambda_1$ *is the subspace* $V_3 = V_3^+ \oplus V_3^-$. *The operators* ΓS_+ *and* ΓS_- *are unitary respectively from* $L^2(H_n)$ *onto* V_3^+ *and from* $L^2_0(H_n)$ *onto* V_3^-. *The orthogonal projections from* $V_2^\perp$ *onto* V_3^+ *and* V_3^- *are*

$$\Pi_\pm = \Gamma S_\pm S_\pm^* \Gamma^* \ .$$

Moreover,

$$\Gamma S_\pm \Big(\Delta_0 + \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \tfrac{n^2}{4}} \Big) = \Delta_1 \Gamma S_\pm \ .$$

Proof. The first part of the statement is obvious. What concerns the action of Δ_1 follows from the fact that, since D_1 commutes with P_0, $P_\pm$,

$$\operatorname{dom}(D_1) = \big(\operatorname{dom}(D_1) \cap W_0 \big) \oplus \big(\operatorname{dom}(D_1) \cap W_+ \big) \oplus \big(\operatorname{dom}(D_1) \cap W_- \big) \ . \qquad \square$$

6. L^p-BOUNDEDNESS OF SPECTRAL MULTIPLIERS OF Δ_1

On the basis of the previous analysis, we can say that

$$\Delta_1 = R\Delta_0 R^{-1} = R\Delta_0 R^*$$

on V_1,

$$\Delta_1 = \Delta_0 \mp iT$$

on $V_2^{\pm}$, and, by Proposition 5.4,

$$\Delta_1 = \Gamma S_{\pm}\Big(\Delta_0 + \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \frac{n^2}{4}}\Big) S_{\pm}^* \Gamma^*$$

on $V_3^{\pm}$.

This implies that, given a bounded Borel function m on $(0,+\infty) = \mathbb{R}_+^*$, the operator $T_m = m(\Delta_1)$ equals

$$Rm(\Delta_0)R^* \ , \qquad m(\Delta_0 \mp iT) \ , \qquad \Gamma S_{\pm} m\Big(\Delta_0 + \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \frac{n^2}{4}}\Big) S_{\pm}^* \Gamma^* \ ,$$

on the corresponding subspaces. Denoting by $P_3 = I - P_1 - P_2^+ - P_2^-$ the orthogonal projection from $L^2\Lambda^1(H_n)$ onto V_3, we obviously have

$$m(\Delta_1) = m(\Delta_1)P_1 + m(\Delta_1)P_2^+ + m(\Delta_1)P_2^- + m(\Delta_1)\Pi_+ P_3 + m(\Delta_1)\Pi_- P_3 \ .$$

Observe that, since $R^*R = I$, we have $R^*P_1 = R^*RR^* = R^*$. Similarly,

$$S_{\pm}^*\Gamma^*\Pi_{\pm} = S_{\pm}^*\Gamma^* \ .$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} m(\Delta_1) &= Rm(\Delta_0)R^* + m(\Delta_0 - iT)P_2^+ + m(\Delta_0 + iT)P_2^- \\ &\quad + \Gamma S_+ m\Big(\Delta_0 + \frac{n}{2} + \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \frac{n^2}{4}}\Big) S_+^* \Gamma^* P_3 \\ &\quad + \Gamma S_- m\Big(\Delta_0 + \frac{n}{2} - \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \frac{n^2}{4}}\Big) S_-^* \Gamma^* P_3 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

We are so led to discuss L^p boundedness of each of the operators appearing in (6.1). For this purpose, we recall the following result, taken from [MRS2, Cor.2.4], and concerning Marcinkiewicz multipliers of $i^{-1}T$ and L. We shall present a series of technical lemmas in a rather self-contained fashion. We do not claim full originality for every single statement. In particular, various overlappings with arguments in [MS] are present. Given $\rho, \sigma > 0$, we say that a function $f(\lambda, \xi)$ is in the mixed Sobolev space $L^2_{\rho,\sigma} = L^2_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ if

$$\|f\|^2_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1+|\xi'|)^{2\rho}(1+|\lambda'|+|\xi'|)^{2\sigma} |\hat{f}(\lambda',\xi')|^2 \, d\lambda' \, d\xi' \tag{6.2}$$

is finite. When ρ and σ are integers, this condition means that the derivatives $\partial_\lambda^i \partial_\xi^j f$ are in L^2 for $i \le \sigma$ and $i + j \le \rho + \sigma$. We shall make use of this characterization, together with the fact that the $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$ form an interpolation family.

Let $\eta \in \mathcal{D}\big((\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2\big)$ be a non-trivial, non-negative, smooth function (briefly, a bump function). We say that a bounded function $\mu(\lambda,\xi)$ defined on $(\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2\big)$ if for every $r = (r_1, r_2) \in (\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$, the function $\mu^r(\lambda,\xi) = \mu(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi)\eta\big(\lambda,\xi\big)$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$ and

$$\|\mu\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}} = \sup_r \|\mu^r\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma}} \tag{6.3}$$

is finite. We extend this definition to functions μ defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^*_+$ by requiring that both $\mu(\lambda,\xi)$ and $\mu(-\lambda,\xi)$ are in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2\big)$.

If ρ and σ are integers, to require that $\mu \in L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2\big)$ is equivalent to requiring that

$$\sup_{r_1,r_2>0} r_1^{-1+2i} r_2^{-1+2j} \int_{r_1<|\lambda|<2r_1\,,\,r_2<\xi<2r_2} \big|\partial_\lambda^i \partial_\xi^j \mu(\lambda,\xi)\big|^2 \, d\lambda \, d\xi < +\infty\ , \tag{6.4}$$

for all i, j such that $i \le \sigma$, $i + j \le \rho + \sigma$. In particular, the definition of $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}$ is independent of the choice of η. The same is true for every $\rho, \sigma > 0$, as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 6.1. *Given two bump functions η_1 and η_2 on $(\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$, the norms* (6.3) *that they define are equivalent. Let Ω be a family of bump functions, such that all the $\eta \in \Omega$ are supported on the same compact subset of $(\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$, and that their C^k-norms are uniformly bounded for some $k \ge \rho + \sigma$. Given another bump function η_0, the norms* (6.3) *defined by the $\eta \in \Omega$ are controlled uniformly by the norm defined by η_0.*

Proof. If $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the operation of multiplication by φ is continuous on $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$, with a norm controlled by the C^k-norm of φ, if $k \ge \rho + \sigma$. This is trivial if ρ and σ are integers, and it follows by interpolation in the general case.

Given η_1 and η_2 as above, there are $r^{(1)}, \dots, r^{(k)} \in (\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$ such that

$$\psi(\lambda,\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^k \eta_1(r_1^{(j)}\lambda, r_2^{(j)}\xi) \ge \delta > 0$$

on the support of η_2. Hence $\eta_2 = \varphi\psi$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu(r\cdot)\eta_2\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma}} &\le C\|\mu(r\cdot)\psi\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma}} \\ &\le C\sum_{j=1}^k \|\mu(r\cdot)\eta_1(r^{(j)}\cdot)\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma}} \\ &\le C'\sum_{j=1}^k \big\|\mu\big(r(r^{(j)})^{-1}\cdot\big)\eta_1\big\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma}}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

and this implies the first part of the statement.

Given a family Ω of bump functions as above, the same ψ can be used for all the $\eta \in \Omega$, because of the condition on the supports. It follows that the set $\{\varphi = \eta/\psi : \eta \in \Omega\}$ is bounded in C^k for every k. Hence the constant C' appearing in (6.5), with $\eta_2 = \eta$ and $\eta_1 = \eta_0$, can be taken independently of η. $\square$

Theorem 6.2 [MRS2]**.** *Let μ be a bounded function in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ for some $\rho > n$ and $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\mu(i^{-1}T, L)$ is bounded on $L^p(H_n)$ for $1 < p < \infty$, with norms controlled by $\|\mu\|_{L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}}$.*

From this statement we shall derive a result concerning spectral multipliers of $\Delta_0 + i\alpha T$ for $|\alpha| < n$. Observe that, if m is a bounded function on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$, then $m(\Delta_0 + i\alpha T) = \mu(i^{-1}T, L)$, with

$$\mu(\lambda, \xi) = m(\lambda^2 + \xi - \alpha\lambda)\ .$$

If $\tau > 0$, we say that $m \in L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ (or that m is a *Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier of order* τ) if

$$\|m\|_{L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}} = \sup_{r>0} \big\|m(r\cdot)\varphi\big\|_{L^2_\tau}$$

is finite, where φ is a non-trivial, non-negative, smooth bump function on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ and the L^2_τ-norm is the ordinary Sobolev norm on $\mathbb{R}$. It will be useful to observe that $m \in L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ if and only if $\mu(\lambda,\xi) = m(\xi)$ is in $L^2_{\tau,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2\big)$ for any σ. In particular, the analogue of Lemma 6.1 can be formulated, with the obvious modifications, for $L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$.

One important technical aspect of our argument is the following.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\rho, \sigma > 0$, $\alpha \in (-n, n)$, and let m be a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier of order $\tau = \rho + \sigma$. Then $\mu(\lambda,\xi) = m(\lambda^2 + \xi - \alpha\lambda)$ coincides on F_n with a function in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{loc}}$.*

This and Theorem 6.2 imply the following result.

Theorem 6.4. *If m is a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier of order $\tau > n + \frac{1}{2}$, then $m(\Delta_0 + i\alpha T)$ is a bounded operator on $L^p(H_n)$ for $|\alpha| < n$ and $1 < p < \infty$.*

The proof of Proposition 6.3 requires a few lemmas.

Lemma 6.5. *If $\mu(\lambda,\xi)$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2\big)$, then $\mu(\lambda^2,\xi)$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+^*)$, with equivalence of norms.*

Proof. Let K be a compact subset of $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2$. If ρ and σ are integers, it is quite clear that a function $f(\lambda,\xi)$ supported on K is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$ if and only if $f(\lambda^2,\xi)$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$. By complex interpolation, the same holds for all $\rho, \sigma > 0$.

In order to prove the Lemma, it is sufficient to consider the restriction $\tilde\mu(\lambda,\xi)$ of $\mu(\lambda^2,\xi)$ to $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2$. If η is a bump function, the $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$-norm of

$$\tilde\mu(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi)\eta(\lambda,\xi) = \mu(r_1^2\lambda^2, r_2\xi)\eta(\lambda,\xi)$$

is controlled by the $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$-norm of $\mu(r_1^2\lambda, r_2\xi)\eta(\sqrt{\lambda},\xi)$. The conclusion follows easily from Lemma 6.1. $\square$

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\mu \in L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2\big)$, and $\delta > 0$. Let also ψ be smooth on $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+^*$, homogeneous of degree zero, and supported on the angle $D_\delta = \{(\lambda,\xi) : \xi \geq (n-\delta)|\lambda|\}$. If $\alpha < n - \delta$, then*

$$\mu'(\lambda,\xi) = \mu(\lambda, \xi - \alpha\lambda)\psi(\lambda,\xi)$$

is also in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2\big)$

Proof. If $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, the linear change of variables $(\lambda, \xi) \longmapsto (\lambda, \xi + \gamma\lambda)$ induces an isomorphism of $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ onto itself, with constants controlled by γ. This follows easily from (6.2). Therefore, if η_0 is a bump function on $(\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$ and $r_1, r_2 > 0$, the $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$-norm of

$$\mu'(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi)\eta(\lambda, \xi) = \mu(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi - \alpha r_1\lambda)\psi(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi)\eta_0(\lambda, \xi)$$

is equivalent to the $L^2_{\rho,\sigma}$-norm of

$$\mu(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi')\psi(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi' + \alpha r_1\lambda)\eta_0\Big(\lambda, \xi' + \alpha\frac{r_1}{r_2}\lambda\Big) ,$$

with constants controlled by the ratio r_1/r_2. Let

$$\eta_r(\lambda, \xi') = \psi(r_1\lambda, r_2\xi' + \alpha r_1\lambda)\eta_0\Big(\lambda, \xi' + \alpha\frac{r_1}{r_2}\lambda\Big) = \psi\Big(\lambda, \frac{r_2}{r_1}\xi' + \alpha\lambda\Big)\eta_0\Big(\lambda, \xi' + \alpha\frac{r_1}{r_2}\lambda\Big) .$$

The conclusion follows if we prove that, for an appropriate choice of η_0, the set $\Omega = \{\eta_r : r \in (\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2\}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 6.1, and that $\eta_r \neq 0$ only if the ratio r_1/r_2 is bounded.

Assume that the support of η_0 is contained in the square $[1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon]^2$, with $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ to be determined. A necessary condition for having $\eta_r \neq 0$ is that there exists (λ, ξ') such that the conditions

$$\Big(\lambda, \xi' + \alpha\frac{r_1}{r_2}\lambda\Big) \in [1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon]^2 , \qquad \Big(\lambda, \frac{r_2}{r_1}\xi' + \alpha\lambda\Big) \in D_\delta , \tag{6.6}$$

are satisfied, or, otherwise stated, that

$$\Big([1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon] \times \Big[\frac{r_2}{r_1}(1-\varepsilon), \frac{r_2}{r_1}(1+\varepsilon)\Big]\Big) \cap D_\delta \neq \emptyset .$$

This occurs if and only if the point $\Big(1-\varepsilon, \frac{r_2}{r_1}(1+\varepsilon)\Big) \in D_\delta$, i.e. if and only if

$$\frac{r_2}{r_1} > (n-\delta)\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} . \tag{6.7}$$

The requirement about the boundedness of the ratios r_1/r_2 is then fulfilled.

Once (6.7) is satisfied, we check that the supports of the η_r are contained in a common compact subset of $(\mathbb{R}^*_+)^2$. Clearly, if $(\lambda, \xi') \in \operatorname{supp}\eta_r$, then $\lambda \in [1-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon]$. As to ξ', we impose, for all the (r_1, r_2) satisfying (6.7), the condition

$$1-\varepsilon \leq \xi' + \alpha\frac{r_1}{r_2}\lambda \leq 1+\varepsilon ,$$

taken from the first of (6.6). The existence of an upper bound for ξ' independent of r follows from the fact that the ratios r_1/r_2 are bounded. For the lower bound, there is no problem if $\alpha \leq 0$. If $0 < \alpha < n-\delta$, taking into account (6.7) and that $\lambda < 1+\varepsilon$, we are done if

$$(1-\varepsilon) - \alpha\frac{1+\varepsilon}{(n-\delta)(1-\varepsilon)}(1+\varepsilon) = (1-\varepsilon)\Big(1 - \frac{\alpha}{n-\delta}\Big(\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\Big)^2\Big) > 0 .$$

This can be obtained by choosing ε small enough. A simple verification shows that the derivatives of the η_r are uniformly bounded, so that the conclusion follows from Lemma 6.1. □

We can now prove Proposition 6.3.

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Given a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier m of order τ on the positive half-line, consider

$$\mu_1(\lambda, \xi) = m(\lambda + \xi)$$

on $(\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2$. Applying Lemma 6.6 to $\mu_0(\lambda, \xi) = m(\xi)$, with $\delta = n$ and $\alpha = -1$, we obtain that $\mu_1 \in L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}\big((\mathbb{R}_+^*)^2\big)$.

By Lemma 6.5, $\mu_2(\lambda, \xi) = m(\lambda^2 + \xi)$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^*)$.

Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\alpha| < n$, take $\delta > 0$, $\delta < n - |\alpha|$ and construct ψ smooth, homogeneous of degree 0 supported on D_δ and equal to 1 on F_n. Applying Lemma 6.6 to $m_2(\pm\lambda, \xi)$ restricted to $(R_+^*)^2$, we conclude that also $\mu_3(\lambda, \xi) = m(\lambda^2 + \xi - \alpha\lambda)\psi(\lambda, \xi)$ is in $L^2_{\rho,\sigma,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^*)$. □

Proposition 6.7. *The operators S_+ and S_- are bounded from $L^p(H_n)$ to $L^p(H_n)^3$ for $1 < p < \infty$.*

Proof. The components of the operators S_+ and S_- are spectral multiplier operators whose multipliers are the components of v_+ and v_-.

It turns out that the half-lines $\xi = n\lambda$ and $\xi = -n\lambda$ play a special role here, which is why we discuss them separately. We restrict ourselves to the half-line $\xi = n\lambda$; the other half-line can be treated in a similar way.

On the former half-line, we have $a = \lambda + \frac{n}{2}$, and, using (5.3), one finds that

$$v_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ i\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2\lambda+n}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{\lambda+n}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_- = \begin{pmatrix} i \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The components of v_+ and v_- are Mihlin-Hörmander multipliers as functions of $\lambda > 0$, and since the operator $\bar{C}$, which corresponds to the restriction to the spectral half-line $\xi = n\lambda$, is L^p-bounded, we see that the components of v_+, v_-, when restricted to this half-line, give rise to L^p-bounded operators for $1 < p < \infty$.

In view of the definition of the Heiseberg fan F_n, it thus suffices to consider the domain where $\xi > (n+1)|\lambda|$. Notice that the components of $v_\pm$ are all products of multipliers of the form

$$\nu_0 = (q_\delta^\varepsilon)^{\frac12} a^{-\frac12}, \qquad \nu_+ = (q_\delta^\varepsilon)^{\frac12}\big(a + \tfrac{n}{2}\big)^{-\frac12}, \qquad \nu_- = (q_\delta^-)^{\frac12}\big(a - \tfrac{n}{2}\big)^{-\frac12}.$$

We show that for $\xi > (n+1)|\lambda|$ they satisfy the pointwise estimates

$$\big|\partial_\lambda^i \partial_\xi^j \nu(\lambda, \xi)\big| \le C_{i,j}|\lambda|^{-i}\xi^{-j} \tag{6.8}$$

for $i = 0, 1$ and j arbitrary. This implies that they can be appropriately extended to the upper half-plane so that (6.4) holds with $\sigma = 1$ and ρ arbitrary, so that the proposition is a consequence of Theorem 6.2.

Using the identity $\partial_\xi a = \partial_\xi q^\varepsilon_\delta = \frac{1}{2a}$, we see by induction that

$$\partial^j_\xi \nu_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{j} c_{jk} (q^\varepsilon_\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-k} a^{-\frac{1}{2}+k-2j} = \nu_0 \sum_{k=0}^{j} c_{jk} (q^\varepsilon_\delta)^{-k} a^{k-2j} \ .$$

To prove (6.8) we shall use the following elementary relation

$$\sqrt{\alpha+\beta} - \sqrt{\alpha} \simeq \begin{cases} \dfrac{\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha}}, & \text{if } \alpha \gtrsim \beta, \\ \sqrt{\beta}, & \text{if } \alpha \lesssim \beta, \end{cases} \tag{6.9}$$

valid for every $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$.

We first consider the case $i = 0$ in (6.8). Clearly, ν_0 is bounded. Moreover,

$$a \simeq \begin{cases} |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2}, & \text{if } |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2} \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ \sqrt{\xi}, & \text{if } |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2} \lesssim \sqrt{\xi}, \end{cases} \tag{6.10}$$

and, by (6.9), since

$$q^\varepsilon_\delta \geq \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2 + \frac{n^2}{4}} - |\lambda| - \frac{n}{2} = \sqrt{\Big(|\lambda| + \frac{n}{2}\Big)^2 + (\xi - n|\lambda|)} - \sqrt{\Big(|\lambda| + \frac{n}{2}\Big)^2} \ ,$$

we have

$$q^\varepsilon_\delta \gtrsim \begin{cases} \dfrac{\xi - n|\lambda|}{|\lambda| + \frac{n}{2}}, & \text{if } |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2} \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi - n|\lambda|}, \\ \sqrt{\xi - n|\lambda|}, & \text{if } |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2} \lesssim \sqrt{\xi - n|\lambda|}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\xi - n|\lambda| \simeq \xi$, since we assume $\xi \geq (n+1)|\lambda|$, and thus

$$q^\varepsilon_\delta \gtrsim \begin{cases} \dfrac{\xi}{|\lambda| + \frac{n}{2}}, & \text{if } |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2} \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ \sqrt{\xi}, & \text{if } |\lambda| + \dfrac{n}{2} \lesssim \sqrt{\xi}. \end{cases} \tag{6.11}$$

For simplicity of notation, let us assume that $\lambda > 0$. Then, by (6.10), (6.11),

$$\begin{aligned} (q^\varepsilon_\delta)^{-k} a^{k-2j} &\lesssim \begin{cases} (\lambda + \dfrac{n}{2})^{2k-2j} \xi^{-k}, & \text{if } \lambda + \dfrac{n}{2} \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ (\sqrt{\xi})^{-2j}, & \text{if } \lambda + \dfrac{n}{2} \lesssim \sqrt{\xi} \end{cases} \\ &\lesssim \xi^{-j}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (6.8) holds for $i = 0$.

Consider now the case $i = 1$. To control $\partial_\lambda \nu_0$, we write $\nu_0 = \psi^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\lambda \psi &= \delta a^{-1} - (\varepsilon \tfrac{n}{2} + \delta\lambda)\lambda a^{-3}\\ &= (\delta(\xi + \tfrac{n^2}{4}) - \varepsilon\tfrac{n}{2}\lambda)a^{-3},\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\partial_\lambda \nu_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}(\delta\xi + \delta\tfrac{n^2}{4} - \varepsilon\tfrac{n}{2}\lambda)(q_\delta^\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}} a^{\frac{1}{2}-3}.$$

By induction, one then finds that

$$\partial_\xi^j \partial_\lambda \nu_0 = \nu_0 \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} c_{jk} (q_\delta^\varepsilon)^{-k-1} a^{k-2j} + \nu_0 \sum_{k=0}^{j} d_{jk} (\delta\xi + \delta\tfrac{n^2}{4} - \varepsilon\tfrac{n}{2}\lambda)(q_\delta^\varepsilon)^{-k-1} a^{k-2(j+1)}.$$

By (6.10), (6.11) (assuming again that $\lambda > 0$) we see that

$$(q_\delta^\varepsilon)^{-k-1} a^{k-2j} \lesssim \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\lambda + \frac{n}{2}} (\lambda + \tfrac{n}{2})^{2k-2(j-1)} \xi^{-k-1}, & \text{if } \lambda + \dfrac{n}{2} \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ \qquad\qquad (\sqrt{\xi})^{-2j-1} & , \text{ if } \lambda + \dfrac{n}{2} \lesssim \sqrt{\xi}. \end{cases}$$

Since $k \le j-1$, these terms are of order $O((\lambda + \frac{n}{2})^{-1}\xi^{-j})$.

Noticing that $|\delta\xi + \delta\frac{n^2}{4} - \varepsilon\frac{n}{2}\lambda| \lesssim 1 + \xi$, when $\xi > (n+1)\lambda$, one finds in a similar way that the terms in the second sum are of the order

$$(1+\xi)(\lambda + \tfrac{n}{2})^{-1}\xi^{-(j+1)} \lesssim \lambda^{-1}\xi^{-j},$$

so that (6.8) also holds for $i = 1$.

Next,

$$\nu_+ = \nu_0 \sqrt{\frac{a}{a + \frac{n}{2}}}\ ,$$

where the square root only depends on $\xi + \lambda^2$, and is a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier in this variable. So Theorem 6.4 applies to this factor.

There remain the multipliers of the form

$$\nu_- = (q_\delta^-)^{\frac{1}{2}} \big(a - \tfrac{n}{2}\big)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We begin with $i = 0$ in (6.8), assuming again for simplicity that $\lambda > 0$. By induction, we here see that

$$\partial_\xi^j \nu_- = \nu_- \sum_{k+l \le j} c_{jkl} (q_\delta^-)^{-k} (a - \tfrac{n}{2})^{-l} a^{k+l-2j}\ .$$

Moreover, by (6.9),

$$\begin{aligned} a - \frac{n}{2} &= \sqrt{\tfrac{n^2}{4} + (\xi + \lambda^2)} - \sqrt{\tfrac{n^2}{4}} \\ &\simeq \begin{cases} \dfrac{\xi + \lambda^2}{n/2}, & \text{if } \frac{n^2}{4} \gtrsim \xi + \lambda^2, \\ \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2}, & \text{if } \frac{n^2}{4} \lesssim \xi + \lambda^2 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Assume first that $\xi \lesssim 1$. Since $\xi > (n+1)\lambda$, then

$$a - \frac{n}{2} \simeq \xi, \quad a \simeq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad q_\delta^- \gtrsim \xi \ .$$

Hence

$$(q_\delta^-)^{-k}(a - \tfrac{n}{2})^{-l} a^{k+l-2j} \lesssim \xi^{-k-l} \lesssim \xi^{-j},$$

so that (6.8) holds.

Let next $\xi \gtrsim 1$. Then $a - \frac{n}{2} \simeq \sqrt{\xi + \lambda^2}$, hence

$$a - \frac{n}{2} \simeq \begin{cases} \lambda, & \text{if } \lambda \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ \sqrt{\xi}, & \text{if } \lambda \lesssim \sqrt{\xi}. \end{cases}$$

In combination with (6.10), (6.11), this gives

$$\begin{aligned}(q_\delta^-)^{-k}(a - \tfrac{n}{2})^{-l} a^{k+l-2j} &\lesssim \begin{cases} \left(\dfrac{\xi}{\lambda}\right)^{-k} \lambda^{-l} \lambda^{k+l-2j}, & \text{if } \lambda \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ \sqrt{\xi}^{-k} \sqrt{\xi}^{-l} \sqrt{\xi}^{k+l-2j}, & \text{if } \lambda \lesssim \sqrt{\xi} \end{cases} \\ &\lesssim \xi^{-j},\end{aligned}$$

so that (6.8) holds for $i = 0$.

Let next $i = 1$. Arguing similarly as for ν_0, we here put

$$\psi = q_\delta^-(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-1} = 1 + \delta\lambda(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-1},$$

so that

$$\partial_\lambda \nu_- = \frac{\delta}{2}\Big(\xi a^{-1}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-1} - \tfrac{n}{2} a^{-1}\Big)(q_\delta^-)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

consists of terms

$$\mu_1 = \xi (q_\delta^-)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-\frac{3}{2}} a^{-1}, \ \mu_2 = (q_\delta^-)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} a^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\xi^j \mu_1 = \nu_- &\sum_{k+l \leq j-1} c_{jkl}\, (q_\delta^-)^{-k-1}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-l-1} a^{-1+k+l-2(j-1)} \\ &+ \nu_- \sum_{k+l \leq j} d_{jkl}\, \xi\, (q_\delta^-)^{-k-1}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-l-1} a^{-1+k+l-2j}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_\xi^j \mu_2 = \nu_- \sum_{k+l \leq j} b_{jkl}\, (q_\delta^-)^{-k-1}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-l} a^{-1+k+l-2j}.$$

If $\xi \lesssim 1$, in view of the previous discussion one easily finds that each term arizing in these sums is of order $O(\xi^{-1-j})$, so that $|\partial_\xi^j \mu_{1/2}| \lesssim \xi^{-1-j} \lesssim \lambda^{-1}\xi^{-j}$.

Similarly, if $\xi \gtrsim 1$, then, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned}&\xi\, (q_\delta^-)^{-k-1}(a - \frac{n}{2})^{-l-1} a^{-1+k+l-2j} \\ &\qquad \lesssim \begin{cases} \xi \left(\dfrac{\xi}{\lambda}\right)^{-k-1} \lambda^{-l-1} \lambda^{-1+k+l-2j}, & \text{if } \lambda \gtrsim \sqrt{\xi}, \\ \xi \sqrt{\xi}^{-k-1} \sqrt{\xi}^{-l-1} \sqrt{\xi}^{-1+k+l-2j}, & \text{if } \lambda \lesssim \sqrt{\xi} \end{cases} \\ &\qquad \lesssim \lambda^{-1}\xi^{-j}\end{aligned}$$

if $k + l \leq j$, and the other terms can be estimated in a similar way.

We thus see that (6.8) also holds for $i = 1$. $\square$

We can now prove our main result.

Theorem 6.8. *If m is a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier of order $\tau > n + \frac{1}{2}$, then $m(\Delta_1)$ is a bounded operator on $L^p\Lambda^1(H_n)$ for $1 < p < \infty$.*

Proof. We show that, if m is as stated, then each individual operator appearing in (6.1) is L^p-bounded. We begin with the orthogonal projections and the intertwining operators. As in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we write the components of $R = d\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ as

$$(B_j L^{-\frac{1}{2}})(L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \ , \qquad (\bar{B}_j L^{-\frac{1}{2}})(L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \ , \qquad T\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ .$$

The Riesz transforms $B_j L^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\bar{B}_j L^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are bounded on L^p, being homogeneous singular integral operators with smooth kernels away from the origin. The operators $L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $T\Delta_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are also bounded on L^p by Theorem 6.2. In fact their spectral multipliers satisfy the stronger pointwise condition (6.8) for every i, j. By duality, R^* is also L^p-bounded. By Corollary 4.8, L^p-boundedness of P_2^+ reduces to L^p-boundedness of $\mathcal{R}$, i.e. of each operator

$$B_j\Box^{-\frac{1}{2}}(I - \bar{C}) = (B_j L^{-\frac{1}{2}})L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Box^{-\frac{1}{2}}(I - \bar{C}) \ .$$

Being homogeneous of degree zero, the spectral multiplier of $L^{\frac{1}{2}}\Box^{-\frac{1}{2}}(I - \bar{C})$ satisfies (6.8), and we can apply again Theorem 6.2. The argument is completely analogous for P_2^-.

It remains to discuss the last two terms. Since Γ and Γ^* only contain $\mathcal{R}, \bar{\mathcal{R}}$ and their adjoints, we can pass directly to $S_\pm$ and $S_\pm^*$, and these operators are L^p-bounded by Proposition 6.7.

We finally consider the terms containing the multiplier m. By Theorem 6.4, $m(\Delta_0)$ is bounded on L^p, and the same is true for $m(\Delta_0 \pm iT)$ as long as $n \geq 2$. On H_1, the restriction of $m(\Delta_0 \mp iT)$ to $V_2^\pm$ equals $m(-T^2)$, as we have already observed in Section 4. Hence this case is even simpler, the conclusion following by transference from $\mathbb{R}$ to H_1 (or by Theorem 6.2). Finally, once we have observed that U is L^p-bounded, it remains to consider $m\Big(\Delta_0 + \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{\Delta_0 + \frac{n^2}{4}}\Big)$. The L^p-boundedness of these operators follows from the fact that also

$$m_\pm(s) = m\Big(s + \frac{n}{2} \pm \sqrt{s + \frac{n^2}{4}}\Big)$$

satisfy a Mihlin-Hörmander condition of order τ, as a consequence of the following last two lemmas. $\Box$

Lemma 6.9. *Let m be a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier of order τ on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$, and let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+^* \to \mathbb{R}_+^*$ be a smooth increasing function with the following properties*

- (i) *there exist exponents γ and γ' such that, if k is the smallest integer greater than or equal to τ and $j \leq k$, then $|\varphi^{(j)}(s)| \leq Ms^{\gamma - j}$ for s close to 0 and $|\varphi^{(j)}(s)| \leq Ms^{\gamma' - j}$ for s close to $+\infty$;*
- (ii) *there is $\delta > 0$ such that, for $j = 0, 1$, $\varphi^{(j)}(s) \geq \delta s^{\gamma - j}$ for s close to 0, and $\varphi^{(j)}(s) \geq \delta s^{\gamma' - j}$ for s close to $+\infty$.*

Then $m \circ \varphi$ is also a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier of order τ.

Proof. Let I, J be compact intervals contained in $\mathbb{R}_+^*$, let $\psi : I \to J$ be a C^k-map with never vanishing derivative, and let $f \in L^2_\tau$ be supported on J. If $\tau \leq k$ is an integer, then $f \circ \psi \in L^2_\tau$, and

(6.12) $$\|f \circ \psi\| \leq C\|f\|$$

with C depending on the C^k-norm of ψ and on the infimum of $|\psi'|$.

By complex interpolation, the same is true for every $\tau \le k$. Take now $m \in L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}(\mathbb{R}^*_+)$, and consider, for $r > 0$,

$$m_r(s) = m \circ \varphi(rs)\eta_0(s) \ ,$$

with η_0 a bump function supported in $I = [1, 2]$. Define, for $r \le 1$,

$$\psi_r(s) = r^{-\gamma}\varphi(rs) \ .$$

By (i) and (ii), $\psi_r(I) \subseteq [\delta, M2^\gamma] = J$. The C^k-norms of the ψ_r are uniformly bounded by (i), and the derivatives ψ'_r are uniformly bounded from below by (ii). By (6.12),

$$\|m_r\|_{L^2_\tau} \le C\|m(r^\gamma\cdot)\eta_0 \circ \psi_r^{-1}\|_{L^2_\tau} \ .$$

Consider the set Ω consisting of the bump functions

$$\eta_r(u) = \eta_0 \circ \psi_r^{-1}(u) = \eta_0\big(r^{-1}\varphi^{-1}(r^\gamma u)\big) \ ,$$

supported on J. It follows from (i) and (ii) that

$$\big|(\varphi^{-1})^{(j)}(u)\big| \le M' u^{\frac{1}{\gamma}-j} \ ,$$

for $j \le k$, and

$$(\varphi^{-1})^{(j)}(u) \ge \delta' u^{\frac{1}{\gamma}-j} \ ,$$

for $j = 0, 1$. These inequalities imply that the η_r have uniformly bounded C^k-norms. Applying now Lemma 6.1, we obtain that

$$\sup_{r\le 1} \|m_r\|_{L^2_\tau} \le C\|m\|_{L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}} \ .$$

The same argument works for $r > 1$, replacing γ with γ'. $\square$

Lemma 6.10. *If $m(s)$ is a Mihlin-Hörmander multiplier on $\mathbb{R}^*_+$ of order $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, the same is true for $\tilde m(s) = m(s + a)$, for every $a > 0$.*

Proof. By scale-invariance, we can assume that $a = 1$. Take a bump function η_0 with sufficiently small support, and consider first r large. By translation-invariance, the L^2_τ-norm of $\tilde m(rs)\eta_0(s)$ equals the L^2_τ-norm of $m(rs)\eta_0(s - r^{-1})$. The functions $\eta_r(s) = \eta_0(s - r^{-1})$ are supported on the same compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^*_+$, so that we can apply Lemma 6.1 to conclude that

$$\sup_{r\ge 1} \|\tilde m(r\cdot)\eta_0\|_{L^2_\tau} \le C\|m\|_{L^2_{\tau,\mathrm{sloc}}} \ .$$

If we now restrict our attention to r small, we can replace m by $m\chi$, where χ is smooth and supported on some interval $[1 - \delta, 1 + M]$. Hence we can assume that $m \in L^2_\tau$, so that $\tilde m$ is the restriction to $\mathbb{R}^*_+$ of a function in L^2_τ, supported on $[-\delta, M]$. We prove that, for r small,

$$\|\tilde m(r\cdot)\eta\|_{L^2_\tau} \le C\|\tilde m\|_{L^2_\tau} \ , \tag{6.13}$$

with C independent of r.

If $\tau = k$ is an integer, it follows from Leibniz's rule that the left-hand side is controlled by the L^2-norms of $r^j \tilde m^{(j)}(rs)$ over the support of η. For $j = 0$, such norms are uniformly bounded by the boundedness of $\tilde m$, and for $j \ge 1$ by change of variable in the L^2-integral. For general τ, (6.13) follows by complex interpolation. $\square$

References

[AD] F. Astengo, B. Di Blasio, *The Gelfand transform of homogeneous distributions on Heisenberg (-type) groups*, preprint.

[DT] P. de Bartolomeis, A. Tomassini, *On formality of some symplectic manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **24** (2001), 1287-1314.

[FS] G. Folland, E. M. Stein, *Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}_b$-complex and analysis on the Heisenberg group*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **27** (1974), 429-522.

[G] D. Geller, *Local solvability and homogeneous distributions on the Heisenberg group*, Comm. PDE **5** (1980), 475-560.

[L] J. Lott, *Heat kernels on covering spaces and topological invariants*, J. Diff. Geom. **35** (1992), 471-510.

[MRS1] D. Müller, F. Ricci, E. M. Stein, *Marcinkiewicz multipliers and multi-parameter structure on Heisenberg(-type) groups, I*, Inv. Math. **119** (1995), 199-233.

[MRS2] D. Müller, F. Ricci, E. M. Stein, *Marcinkiewicz multipliers and multi-parameter structure on Heisenberg(-type) groups, II*, Math. Z. **221** (1996), 267-291.

[MS] D. Müller, E. M. Stein, *On spectral multipliers for Heisenberg and related groups*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **73** (1994), 413-440.

[NRS] A. Nagel, F. Ricci, E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis and fundamental solutions on nilpotent Lie groups*, In: Analysis and Partial Differential Equations (C. Sadosky ed.). Lecture Notes in Pure Appl. Math. M. Dekker NY **122** (1990), 249-275.

[R1] M. Rumin, *Formes différentielles sur les variétés de contact*, J. Diff. Geom. **39** (1994), 281-330.

[R2] M. Rumin, *Sub-Riemannian limit of the differential form spectrum of contact manifolds*, GAFA **10** (2000), 407-452.

[S] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis. Real Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.

[W] A. Weil, *Introduction à l'étude des variétés kählériennes*, Hermann, 1958.

Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Mathematisches Seminar, Ludewig- Meyn-Str. 4, D-24098 Kiel, Germany
E-mail address: `mueller@math.uni-kiel.de`
URL: `http://analysis.math.uni-kiel.de/mueller`

Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy
E-mail address: `peloso@calvino.polito.it`
URL: `http://calvino.polito.it/p̃eloso/`

Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, 56126 Pisa, Italy
E-mail address: `fricci@sns.it`
URL: `http://www.math.sns.it/HomePages/Ricci/`